

Appl. No. 10/065,953
Amdt. Dated May. 26, 2004
Reply to Office action of Feb. 26, 2004

Remarks/Arguments

Considering the outstanding Office Action, the applicant has amended the specification and claims to more particularly define the invention. The specification and claims have been amended to correct some errors mentioned in Office Action. In the specification, the typing error and the ambiguous phrase are corrected. In Claim 1-6, the grammatical errors and ambiguous phrases are corrected. In Claim 1, the preambles are amended to recite an illumination system. The amendments do not introduce new matter and are fully supported by the specification and drawings as originally filed.


In Office Action, the Examiner rejects the invention under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi et al(U.S. Patent 6,132,049). Applicants have carefully considered the rejection but it is most respectfully traversed for the reason discussed below.

Yamaguchi et al discloses that an air duct body 30 with a bottom surface attached to the optical unit 5. In the present invention, an air duct body 32 with a bottom opening attached on the side of the lamp base 111. The mounting positions are quite different each other. In the specification of U.S. Patent 6,132,049, the cross-section area of the air duct body 30 must be so extensive enough as to cover the intakes 31R, 31G and 31B completely. In the present invention, the air duct body 32 cannot cover all of the ducts via which air is guided to the desired cooling devices. The inventors use an external air duct 33 outside of air duct body 32 to guide a part of air in the air duct body 32 to cool a desired cooling device which the air duct body 32 cannot cover. When at least one of the desired cooling devices is distant from the others, the present invention can cool all of them by the air duct body 32, but Yamaguchi et al cannot. Furthermore, the fixture of the invention quite differs from that of Yamaguchi et al.

Appl. No. 10/065,953
Amdt. Dated May. 26, 2004
Reply to Office action of Feb. 26, 2004

In view of the above corrections and further amendments,
favorable reconsideration and allowance of claim now present in the
application are most respectfully requested.

Sincerely yours,



Date: 6/15/2004

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No.41,526

P.O.BOX 506

Merrifield, VA22116

U.S.A.

e-mail:winstonhsu@naipo.com.tw

(Please contact me by e-mail if you need a telephone
communication and I will return your call promptly.)